



3-21-06

IFW

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re:

Applicants: Morrison et al. Atty. Docket No.: OWE5006-US  
Serial No.: 10/686,385 Examiner: unassigned  
Filing Date: October 14, 2003 Art Unit: 3621  
Entitled: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR REMOTE PROCESSING OF PHARMACY ORDERS

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.10(a)

Date of Deposit: 3/20/2006

I hereby certify that this Supplemental IDS is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service, as U.S. Express Mail No. EV706358064US, postage prepaid, to: Commissioner for Patents, MAIL STOP – IDS (NO FEE), P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

  
Jennifer Warner

Jennifer Warner

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

As authorized and encouraged under 37 C.F.R. §§1.97-1.98 and the provisions of MPEP §§609 and 707.05(b), Applicants herewith certain patent references, publications and/or other information which the Patent and Trademark Office may wish to consider in examining the above-identified patent application. With regard to the above-identified application, the items of information listed on the enclosed Form 1449 are brought to the attention of the Examiner to supplement the IDS filed May 16, 2005. These additional references are reported from a search conducted in the PCT. This Supplemental IDS is being filed before the mailing date of any action received in the above application.

Applicants are submitting this art because they recognize their duty to disclose pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.56. However, submission of this art and Statement is not an admission that any item identified contains matter that anticipates the invention or that renders the invention obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Further, Applicants believe that none of the art

submitted herewith, alone or in proper combination, discloses, teaches or suggests the invention claimed by Applicants.

No representation is made that a reference constitutes prior art within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 and Applicants reserve the right, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.131 or otherwise to establish that the reference(s) are not "prior art." Moreover, Applicants do not represent that a reference has been thoroughly reviewed or that any relevance of any portion of a reference is intended.

Consideration of the items listed is respectfully requested. Pursuant to the provisions of M.P.E.P. §609, it is requested that the Examiner return a copy of the attached Form 1449, marked as being considered and initialed by the Examiner, to the undersigned with the next official communication.

**U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS**

U.S. PATENT NUMBER	INVENTOR(S)
5,737,539	East
5,911,687	Edelson et al.
5,963,453	Sato et al.
6,202,923	Boyer et al.

**FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS**

None

**OTHER DOCUMENTS**

None

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/20/06

By:

  
Michael D. Steffensmeier, Reg. No. 37,735  
Attorney for Applicants  
Cardinal Health, Inc.  
7000 Cardinal Place  
Dublin, Ohio 43017  
Telephone: (614) 757-7861  
Facsimile: (614) 757-2243



**FORM PTO-1449 TO BE FILED WITH THE  
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

U.S. Department of Commerce  
Patent and Trademark Office

Docket No.: OWE-5006-US Serial No.: 10/686,385

Morrison et al.

Applicant

**INFORMATION DISCLOSURE  
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT**

October 14, 2003

3621

Filing Date

Group Art Unit

Unassigned  
Examiner's Name

**U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS**

<u>Examiner's Initials</u>	<u>Document No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Inventor(s)</u>	<u>Class/Sub-class</u>
	5,737,539	Oct. 5, 1999	East	364/479.14
	5,911,687	Apr. 7, 1998	Edelson et al.	395/203
	5,963,453	Jun. 15, 1999	Sato et al.	600/300
	6,202,923	Mar. 20, 2001	Boyer et al.	235/375

**FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS**

None

**OTHER DOCUMENTS**

None

Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Considered: \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP §609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to Applicant.

The identification of any document herein is not intended to be, and should not be understood as being an admission that each such document, in fact, constitutes "prior art" within the meaning of applicable law since, for example, a given document may have a later effective date than at first seems apparent or the document may have an effective date which can be antedated. The "prior art" status of any document is a matter to be resolved during prosecution.